

The purpose of this MOD 5 Amendment is to extend the solicitation closing date, revise the solicitation, and to provide responses to questions from prospective Offerors. The questions, responses, and solicitation revisions herein are incorporated by reference into Solicitation No. GS00Q-13-DR-0002 - ON-RAMP (POOL 2).

REVISIONS TO THE SOLICITATION:

1. This MOD 5 amendment revises Section L.3., paragraph (a), as follows:

L.3. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

- (a) **This Solicitation closes and proposals are due on Thursday, January 26th, 2017 at 4:30 p.m. Central Standard Time (CST).**
2. This MOD 5 Amendment replaces Section J.7., Attachment (7) in its entirety due to missing Background Information for Relevant Experience Project 5-Alternate. In addition, Question 1 for each Project under scoring related information was changed to "Was the project solicited under or reported under a NAICS OR PSC CODE that correlates any NAICS CODE OR PSC CODE in the Table under Section L.5.3.2.1.?"
 3. **IMPORTANT:** Offerors are to complete the newly revised Section J.7., Attachment (7) template under MOD 5 in FBO.GOV. The header of the form will have MOD 5 identified.
 4. This MOD 5 Amendment revises Section L.5.3.2.1., paragraph (a), as follows:

L.5.3.2.1. Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects under an OASIS SB NAICS Code or PSC Code

- (a) The Offeror will receive points if a Relevant Experience (Primary) Project has any reported NAICS Code or PSC Code listed as follows:

NAICS CODES	
NAICS CODE	NAICS TITLE
541330	Engineering Services
541360	Geophysical Surveying and Mapping Services
541370	Surveying And Mapping (Except Geophysical) Services
541380	Testing Laboratories
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services
541612	Human Resources Consulting Services (2007), Human Resources and Executive Search Consulting Services (2002)
541613	Marketing Consulting Services
541614	Process, Physical Distribution, and Logistics Consulting Services
541618	Other Management Consulting Services
541620	Environmental Consulting Services
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services
541810	Advertising Agencies
541820	Public Relations Agencies
541830	Media Buying Agencies
541840	Media Representatives
541850	Outdoor Advertising
541860	Direct Mail Advertising

541870	Advertising Material Distribution Services
541890	Other Services Related to Advertising
541910	Marketing Research and Public Opinion Polling
541990	All Other Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
541211	Offices of Certified Public Accountants
541213	Tax Preparation Services
541214	Payroll Services
541219	Other Accounting Services
541720	Research and Development in the Social Sciences and Humanities
541710	Research and Development in Biotechnology the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences (Biotechnology may be included or excluded)
541711	Research and Development in Biotechnology
541712	Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences (except Biotechnology)

PSC Codes	
PSC CODE	DESCRIPTION
Multiple	Any Category R Support (Professional/Administrative/Management) Code
Multiple	Any Category A Research and Development Code

5. This MOD 5 Amendment replaces Section M.5.1.1. in its entirety as follows:

M.5.1.1. Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects under an OASIS SB NAICS Code or PSC Code

(a) For each Relevant Experience (Primary) Project submitted, the Offeror will receive 150 points if the Project has a reported NAICS Code or PSC Code associated to the Project that correlates directly to any of the NAICS Codes or PSC Codes identified in Section L.5.3.2.1. regardless if the same NAICS Code or PSC Code is duplicated across different Projects.

1. Example 1: Projects 1 through 4 are under the same NAICS Code 541720 and Project 5 is under NAICS Code 541219. The Offeror receives the maximum 750 points.
2. Example 2: Projects 1 through 3 are under NAICS Code 541219, Project 4 is under NAICS Code 541512, and Project 5 is under NAICS Code 541618. The Offeror receives 600 points since Project 4 is not a NAICS Code identified in Section L.5.3.2.1.
3. Example 3: Projects 1 and 2 are under PSC Code R703, Project 3 is under NAICS Code 541712, and Projects 4 and 5 do not have a NAICS Code or PSC Code assigned to them since the Project was not awarded by the U.S. Federal Government. The Offeror receives 450 points since Projects 4 and 5 do not have NAICS Codes associated to them.

6. Under the Scored Evaluation Criteria of the Section M.6. Scoring Table, this MOD 5 Amendment replaces Section L.5.3.2.1., Relevant Experience (Primary) Project under an OASIS SB NAICS or PSC Code, with the following:

Project reported under a NAICS Code or PSC Code that correlates directly to an OASIS SB NAICS Code or PSC Code in Section L.5.3.2.1.

7. This MOD 5 amendment replaces Section M.5.1.11. in its entirety as follows:

M.5.1.11. Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with MA-IDIQ Contracts or MA-BPAs with Task Orders

- (a) For each Relevant Experience (Secondary) Project submitted, the Offeror will receive points if the Project involves any combination of Multiple Award, Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity contracts (MA-IDIQ) and/or Multiple Award, Blanket Purchase Agreements (MA-BPAs) with Task Orders as follows:
1. Any combination of 2 to 4 MA-IDIQ contracts or MA-BPAs with at least 4 total Task Order awards combined. At least Two Task Orders must have been awarded under each of the Multiple Award Contracts. This is worth 50 points
 2. Any combination of 5 to 9 MA-IDIQ contracts or MA-BPAs with at least 10 total Task Order awards combined. At least Two Task Orders must have been awarded under each of the Multiple Award Contracts. This is worth 100 points.
 3. Any combination of 10 or more MA-IDIQ contracts or MA-BPAs with at least 20 total Task Order awards combined. At least Two Task Orders must have been awarded under each of the Multiple Award Contracts. This is worth 150 points.

8. Under the Scored Evaluation Criteria of the Section M.6. Scoring Table, this MOD 5 Amendment replaces Section L.5.3.2., MA-IDIQ or MA-BPA / Task Orders, with the following:

Any combination of 2 to 4 MA-IDIQ contracts or MA-BPAs with at least 4 total Task Order awards combined. At least Two Task Orders must have been awarded under each of the Multiple Award Contracts.

Any combination of 5 to 9 MA-IDIQ contracts or MA-BPAs with at least 10 total Task Order awards combined. At least Two Task Orders must have been awarded under each of the Multiple Award Contracts.

Any combination of 10 or more MA-IDIQ contracts or MA-BPAs with at least 20 total Task Order awards combined. At least Two Task Orders must have been awarded under each of the Multiple Award Contracts.

9. In Section M.3., paragraph (i), this MOD 5 Amendment corrects the term "Small Disadvantaged Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)", with the term "Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)"
10. In Section J.2., Attachment (2), this MOD 5 Amendment corrects the ranges for both Labor ID #103 and #104 from \$49.11 to \$48.20 and \$63.85 to \$57.43 to \$48.20 to \$49.11 and \$57.43 to \$63.85 respectively.
11. In Section J.5.1., Attachment 5A, Section L.5.3.2.1., Relevant Experience (Primary) Project under an OASIS SB NAICS or PSC Code, this MOD 5 Amendment corrects the following Section identification as follows:
- Is EACH Project reported under any NAICS code or PSC Code identified in Section L.5.3.2.1.?
12. In Section J.5.2., Attachment 5B, Section L.5.3.2.1., Relevant Experience (Primary) Project under an OASIS SB NAICS or PSC Code, this MOD 5 Amendment corrects the following Section identification:
- Is EACH Project reported under any NAICS code or PSC Code identified in Section L.5.3.2.1.?

QUESTIONS FROM PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS AND RESPONSES:

The previous MOD 4 Amendment answered questions from 1 through 85; therefore, this MOD 5 Amendment starts at question 86.

86. With the numerous Amendments and Modifications, will the Government provide a “conformed” version of the requirement?

Response: No. Solicitation amendments are a normal part of the procurement process to help clarify the solicitation requirements.

- MOD 2 is the initial OASIS SB Pool 2 on-ramp solicitation (dated 11/09/2016)
- MOD 3 Amendment revised the minimum requirement for the combined annual value of all Projects combined under Section L.5.3.1. Paragraph (b)7.b. on Page 92 and revised Section A.1.2. (dated 11/17/2016)
- MOD 4 Amendment answered Questions 1 through 85 from Prospective Offerors (dated 12/16/2016)

This latest MOD 5 Amendment answers Questions 86 through 135 from Prospective Offerors and makes revisions to the solicitation. We do not anticipate any further Mod Amendments unless there is an unforeseen circumstance that would necessitate a revision to the solicitation document.

87. Under Relevant Experience Project 5 – Background Information, the form states - Note: if Project 5, is a “Collection of Task Orders” skip to Project 5A. Should this statement have been inserted after questions 1 thru 7 so you can still capture our Contract #, Period of Performance, POCs etc.? If you skip to Project 5A that information is not included.

Response: The background section for Project 5A is inadvertently missing in Section J.7., Attachment (7). Thank you for bringing this to our attention. See Revisions to the Solicitation above. Offerors are to complete the newly revised Section J.7. template attached under this MOD 5 Amendment in FBO.GOV. The header of the form will have MOD 5 identified.

88. RFP Section J.2, Attachment 2, Direct Labor Rate Ranges, Labor ID #'s 103 and 104 reflect Direct Labor Rate Ranges with the Low listed rates as higher than the High listed rates. It appears the low and high rates for these two ID's were inadvertently reversed. Request Government clarification.

Response: The numbers are inadvertently transposed. Please submit a direct labor rate somewhere between the two figures. Thank you for bringing this to our attention. See Revisions to the Solicitation above.

89. Please clarify if 5 MA-IDIQ or 5 MA-BPA's receive a score of 100 points on the Self-Scoring Worksheet. The Self-Scoring Worksheet conflicts with the evaluation criteria listed at M.5.1.11 (c).

Response: See Revisions to Section M.5.1.11 above.

90. Based on the above noted Amendments/Modifications, are vendors to assume that Amendment #11, Mod #2 (posted 11/9/2016) Attachments J1-15 are the final versions to be completed and submitted?

Response: Unless otherwise changed in a subsequent MOD Amendment, the only new form you need to fill out is Section J.7. Attachment (7) in accordance with MOD 5 Amendment. Other forms have changes to them identified herein and incorporated by reference, however, you can use the original forms for proposal submission purposes.

91. The Government states, "The Offeror shall fill out blocks 12 through blocks 18 of the SF33 as the Official Legal Entity in accordance with Section L.2.8..." In the SF 33 template Block 15A there is a box for Facility. Can the government define the number that needs to be provided?

Response: Block 15A is where you enter your company name, address and in the little box marked "code" your Cage Code, and if you have one, a "Facility Code." Facility Codes are only to be supplied if applicable, which would only be if you have multiple facility codes associated with your Cage Code.

92. I ask that you reconsider this requirement to restate that the contract plus options be at least \$150K rather than \$150 in one year.

Response: The requirement of \$150K per year already represents a significant lowering of the qualifications from the \$750K per year in the original procurement. \$150K per year represents the minimum ordering threshold for OASIS SB and consideration of anything lower than this amount is not relevant to the task orders that will be conducted on these contracts. Accordingly, we do not anticipate changing these requirements.

93. In re: form J9 (Cost/Price Template) - Can offerors propose for some labor categories now and some after award (if/when they become necessary), or are they required to propose prospective direct cost rates for all LCs now in order to have those bill rates available for use later?

Response: Propose ALL Labor Category pricing now please.

94. In re: form J7 (Relevant Experience – Primary), Background Information, Questions 1 through 3 – How do offerors answer "Prime Contractor" and "type of vehicle" for SBA 8(a) contracts in form J7, given that the SBA is technically the prime and the contractor is the 8(a) subcontractor? Should they be described as a "Task Order" given that the offeror has privity of contract with the client agency?

Response: If issued under an IDIQ contract, then label it a task order. Otherwise, label it a contract.

95. Our company meets the Small Business Size Standard of \$20.5 Million Pool 2 SB On-ramp. However, the work (current/past) have been awarded with NAICS code 541330 (Engineering Services) which is the major type of work effort under the contracts. Conversely, there are parts within these contracts that could fall into one or two of the NAICS codes listed for Pool 2 SB On-ramp. Are we able to qualify for Pool 2 SB On-ramp even through the contracts were awarded under 541330 which is the correct NAICS code?

Response: No.

96. Page 92, Section L.5.3.1., paragraph (b)7.c. defines Annual Project Value for completed Projects as total obligated dollars divided by the total number of months of performance multiplied by 12. Can you confirm that a completed project with total obligated dollars of \$100K and a two month performance period would have an Annual Project Value of \$600K (\$100k divided by 2 times 12 months) and thus would meet the \$150k annual threshold under paragraph (b)7.a.?

Response: That is correct.

97. MOD 3 Amendment changed Page 92, Section L.5.3.1., paragraph (b)7.b. and lowered the threshold from \$750k down to \$150k for all relevant experience primary projects. However, the MOD did not amend the scoring spreadsheet under Section J.7. Attachment 7 thus no points are given until the annual project value reaches \$750k. Was this an oversight or are points only provided for primary projects at the \$750k level or above?

Response: That is no oversight. Points are only provided for Relevant Experience Primary Projects valued at \$750K and above. The scoring mechanisms for the on-ramp are 100% identical to the original solicitation and shall remain that way.

98. "All Category R Support (Professional/Administrative/Management) Codes not assigned to a different Pool". What does this mean? What about PSC "R" codes mapped to other NAICS codes. For example, we have past performance in 561110 Office Administration and the PSC Code in FPDS is R699. Could I count that as being in Pool 1 for the self scoring worksheet?

Response: For Pool Qualification Projects refer to the NAICS Codes and PSC Codes identified in Section L.5.1.2. For Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects under an OASIS SB NAICS Code or PSC Code in the Self Scoring worksheet, refer to the NAICS Codes and PSC Codes listed in Section L.5.3.2.1., paragraph (a). Note: Section L.5.3.2.1., paragraph (a) has been revised under this MOD 5 Amendment. See revisions to the solicitation above.

99. In reviewing some of the documentation I had thought that management consulting services, Financial Management Services and Program Management Services that are usually NAICS 541618 are core disciplines that qualify. Does this NAICS qualify for this on boarding? If not will there be onboarding for these core disciplines in the future?

Response: No. NAICS code 541618 is entitled "Other Management Consulting Services" and is assigned to OASIS SB Pool 1. Accordingly, it is not sufficient for Pool 2 qualification. The Pool 2 NAICS codes include 541211, 541213, 541214, 541219, and/or 541720. Additionally, PSC codes can be utilized for Pool Qualification and those codes include R703, R704, R705, R710, R711, R712, R713, and several codes applying to Research and Development identified in the solicitation. There is no set schedule for Pool 1 on-ramping other than we know for certain there will be a major on-ramp at the recertification stage of OASIS SB in early 2019.

100. We do not have a FULL year of experience with FEDERAL agencies providing Financial Management services - this past year we have been awarded a couple of Prime contracts for Budget Analyst, Financial Specialist, Sr. Financial Systems Mgmt, Contract close-out, etc...some are high level financial positions. There is nothing in CPARS for us. Can we use any/all of these contracts as past performance?

Response: Each Pool Qualification Project must have at least 1 year of performance unless one of the following situations exist:

1. The Project has a completed Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR)
2. The Project has a completed Award Fee rating (FAR 16.401) for Past Performance
3. The Project had a base period of performance less than 1 year and that period of performance is complete.

101. We previously serviced Program Budget & Financial Management contracts but with non-government agencies. Is this acceptable past performance?

Response: Non-government projects can be used as Relevant Experience Primary Project, but not as Pool Qualifying projects.

102. Our past/current contracts' NAICS are not identified as 541211, 541213, 541214, 541219 or 541720, however, the services we provided on these contracts match the services that you are seeking on the OASIS pool 2. Do we still qualify?

Response: Pool Qualifying projects MUST be performed under one of the NAICS or PSC codes identified in Section L.5.1.2. of the solicitation or they will be rejected. There is no exception to this.

103. One of our contracts (Federal) is under NAICS 541219 but we do not have 1 year of performance. Clarifying that we can utilize this contract for the Pool Qualification?

Response: Each Pool Qualification Project must have at least 1 year of performance unless one of the following situations exist:

1. The Project has a completed Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR)
2. The Project has a completed Award Fee rating (FAR 16.401) for Past Performance
3. The Project had a base period of performance less than 1 year and that period of performance is complete.

104. Also we won't have any 'Relevant Experience' on FEDERAL projects since we do not have the 1 year of performance on any of our Federal contracts - does this disqualify us? We do have relevant experience outside Federal though.

Response: You may use commercial projects as Relevant Experience Primary Projects, but not as Pool Qualification projects.

105. If we only have one Pool 2 qualifying project (prime contractor) with a Pool 2 NAICS or PSC code, but four other prime contracts as task orders under the Navy's Seaport-e IDIQ MAC (that uses the Engineering Services NAICS code 541330) and these task orders contain SOWs that clearly reflect work in the area of Financial Services (NAICS code 541219, Other Accounting Services / PSC Code R710 Support – Management: Financial), can we still qualify for a Pool 2 award?

Response: We included a NAICS Code Change Letter template (Attachment J.15) for exactly this scenario. If you have task orders issued under an IDIQ contract like Seaport and the predominance of the labor on that task order should be identified under a different NAICS code, we allow the Seaport Contracting Officer to change the NAICS code for that task order and thereby allow you to qualify.

106. Do you anticipate extending the deadline for submission of proposals?

Response: Yes. Section L.3., paragraph (a) has been revised under this MOD 5 Amendment. See revisions to the solicitation above.

107. We use Quickbooks for our accounting. We have won government contracts at DHS, DoD and HUD with this as our accounting software. Will it be acceptable for OASIS?

Response: No. All accounting systems will have to pass DCAA standards.

108. We have conducted numerous surveys under NAICS Code 541611. Will this be acceptable as a past performance? You currently require evidence of NAICS Code 541720 for surveys per the solicitation.

Response: For Pool Qualification Projects, NAICS 541611 is not in Pool 2. You can attempt to get the contracting officer to correct the NAICS code assignment in accordance with Section J.14., but we will not accept NAICS codes that are not assigned to Pool 2 for the purposes of pool qualification.

109. On page 92 of the solicitation, #7b., did you mean to state that the annual value of all projects combined must be equal to or greater than \$150,000 per year times the number of projects submitted?

Response: Yes.

110. Section J.5.1 Attachment (5A) – Self Scoring Worksheet – Under the Systems, Certifications, and Clearances section of the worksheet, does not allow the offeror to achieve points for having an approved accounting system. Since the Accounting Systems are the only mandatory requirements under this section, will the Government revise the self-scoring worksheet to include this line item?

Response: No. There are two reasons for this. First, the on-ramp scoring criteria must remain identical to the original solicitation. Second, there is no logical reason to assign points to a mandatory element. If all Offerors must have it, then all Offerors would get the points and thereby the assignment of points does absolutely nothing to segregate between Offerors, which is the entire objective of evaluation.

111. Section J.4 Attachment (4) – Proposal Checklist (Volume 5 – Systems, Certifications, and Clearances) – The Checklist does not allow offeror opportunity to annotate taking credit for an approved accounting system. Since the Accounting Systems are the only mandatory requirements under this section, will the Government revise the proposal checklist to include this line item?

Response: No. See previous response.

112. Our firm has been working on the same project with the same client since 2013 however the work has been issued incrementally under Seaport-e and under numerous different contract numbers. This does not fit the scenario of a collection of task orders under a single award IDIQ because its Seaport-e so how can we take advantage of the larger dollar amount of the whole contract when we can only reference one task order which is only a small portion of the total contract dollar amount?

Response: We are very sorry about the manner in which your referenced project was administered, but we cannot allow exceptions to the guidelines identified in the solicitation.

113. As proof of Pool Qualification, the RFP states that the offeror must submit a copy of the Contract or Task Order Award Form. If our Award doc contains a PWS and other documentation in addition to the required SF form should we include also or delete those sections?

Response: Offerors only need to submit sufficient evidence to validate what is being claimed to satisfy the solicitation requirements in accordance with the instructions of the solicitation.

114. This para reads, "the Government intends to award at least three HUBZone Small Businesses, two Small Disadvantaged Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSB)....Should this read Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business versus "Small Disadvantaged"?

Response: Yes. Section M.3., paragraph (i) has been corrected under this MOD 5 Amendment. See revisions to the solicitation above.

115. The RFP states, "the Offeror must provide evidence of the Annual Project Value for each Pool Qualification Project. Can you clarify what we can highlight that would provide that evidence since its value is calculated by dividing the # of months of performance into total obligated dollars or total estimated value? The \$ values on the award contract for each year may not show the exact annual amount.

Response: We need to evidence of the total dollars obligated and the total period of performance. This could include the original award document, modifications, or any other official documentation.

116. On November 17th, Mod 3 was issued and on December 16th Mod 4 which included an SF30 and an additional data document. Are we required to sign the SF30 and return with our submission and if so, which volume should it be included with?

Response: No, per the instructions on the SF30, Offerors are not required to sign and return that document. Offerors do, however, need to acknowledge the MOD amendments in the SF33, which must be signed and submitted in Volume 1. See Section A.1.2. under the MOD 2 Amendment.

117. The RFP states that the offeror will receive additional points if the Project involves performance in Multiple locations. If the offeror's project is performed both at a government agency and at a contractor site, which is stated in the PWS, does the contractor site count as one of the locations?

Response: To qualify for Multiple Locations, each location must be in a different MSA. Please see the instructions and examples in Section M.5.1.4.

118. Attachment J.7 #3 asks the question – “What is the TYPE OF VEHICLE?” and it allows you to only check one. Our firm is utilizing a project that happens to be a Task Order under a Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA), and the BPA is a Task Order under a Federal Supply Schedule (which is our GSA PSS Schedule Contract). So which block would we check if we cannot check more than one?

- CONTRACT (NOT a Task Order)
- TASK ORDER UNDER A FEDERAL SUPPLY SCHEDULE (FAR 8.405-2)
- TASK ORDER UNDER A MASTER IDIQ TASK ORDER CONTRACT (FAR 16.501-1)
- TASK ORDER UNDER A BLANKET PURCHASE AGREEMENT (FAR 8.405-3 or FAR 13.303)

Response: We apologize for having to correct some of the language of the question, but a BPA cannot be a task order. A BPA is simply an agreement. BPAs can be established under a GSA Schedule contract, but they are NOT task orders. If the project was issued as a call under a BPA, then select "TASK ORDER UNDER A BLANKET PURCHASE AGREEMENT".

119. Do the Relevant Experience Projects used for additional Scoring points (L.5.3.2.3 thru L.5.3.3.1) have to be the same 5 projects used for evaluation in 5.3.2.1?

Response: Yes. The same 3-5 Relevant Experience Primary Projects are used for all Relevant Experience Primary Project scoring.

120. Do vendor projects being evaluated for falling under specific mission spaces have to be prime projects or can the vendor have been a subcontractor?

Response: Prime projects only.

121. Do vendor projects being evaluated for falling under specific mission spaces have to fall under the NAICS/PSC code requirements?

Response: No. Those projects may be under any NAICS code.

122. If a vendor has projects in only Mission Spaces #1, #2, and #4, should the file names end in MS1, MS2, and MS4 OR should they just be sequential files ending in MS1, MS2 and MS3?

Response: It does not matter so long as we can clearly ascertain what the documents are and they track with your proposal.

123. If one of our relevant experience projects has a CPARS that is more than a year old, for example covers up through June of 2015 and our customer has not done one since, must we submit that or can we substitute with a recent completed Past Performance Rating Form?

Response: If a CPARS exists, we will use the latest CPARS regardless of its age.

124. Can the government please confirm that these low and high ranges are direct labor base figures reflecting low and high position salaries?

Response: Confirmed. Offerors are strongly cautioned to propose direct labor rates within the ranges provided.

125. We use Quickbooks for our accounting. We have won government contracts at DHS, DoD and HUD with this as our accounting software. Will it be acceptable for OASIS?

Response: No. All accounting systems will have to pass DCAA standards.

126. We have conducted numerous surveys under NAICS Code 541611. Will this be acceptable as a past performance? You currently require evidence of NAICS Code 541720 for surveys per the solicitation.

Response: For Pool Qualification Projects, the answer is No. NAICS 541611 is not in Pool 2. You can attempt to get the contracting officer to change the NAICS code assignment in accordance with the instructions set forth in the solicitation, but we will not accept NAICS codes that are not assigned to Pool 2 for the purposes of pool qualification.

127. Section III -FINANCIAL STATEMENTS states "Prepared Financial Statements with notes may be provided in lieu of completing Section III" Would a Profit/Loss Statement suffice in lieu of completing Section IV-INCOME STATEMENT?

Response: No. Please fill out Section III – Financial Statements and Section IV Income Statements in accordance with the instructions in Section L.5.2.1.

128. In reference to solicitation section L.5.1.10 (c) (2) (Page 99) Existing Partnerships or Joint Venture, that requires all minimum requirements and evaluation criteria including past performance to be performed by the existing partnership or Joint Venture, not the individual team members, would the government consider revising the requirement to be in compliance with the 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) which specifies that past performance can come from either team member for purposes of evaluation? Specifically, the 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) modified how past performance should be evaluated for joint ventures: CFR 125.8(e), "when evaluating the past performance and experience of an entity submitting an offer for a contract set aside or reserved for small business as a joint venture established pursuant to this section, a procuring activity must consider work done individually by each partner to the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself previously." Therefore, will the government modify the requirements to address the updated and germane law within Defense Authorization Act to consider past performance be evaluated from either team member of an Existing Partnership or Joint Venture?

Response: Absolutely not. There are two fundamental reasons for this. First, this is an on-ramp, not a new solicitation. On-ramps are a re-opening of the original solicitation. Accordingly, the terms and conditions of the original solicitation remain in place. Otherwise, you would have contract awards for the same contract environment based upon differing criteria and rules. Secondly, the provisions of the 2016 NDAA have not been vetted through the FAR Council and implemented into the Federal Acquisition Regulation. Btw, the 2016 NDAA was vetoed by the President of the United States.

129. 1) If the Pool Qualification Project just started recently, do we need to submit a Past Performance Rating Form to the customer to complete?

Response: To clarify our previous responses to this question, we answered with the assumption that the contract in question was less than a year but was complete. All Pool Qualifying Projects are subject to the requirements stated in Section L.5.1.2, which states:

Each Pool Qualification Project must have at least 1 year of performance unless one of the following situations exist:

1. The Project has a completed Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR)
2. The Project has a completed Award Fee rating (FAR 16.401) for Past Performance
3. The Project had a base period of performance less than 1 year and that period of performance is complete.

130. I saw a "RELEVANT EXPERIENCE PROJECT 1" form that we used for our 1 relevant project. Which form do we use for the Pool Qualification experience?

Response: We do not understand the question. Please restate the question and include references to the solicitation if possible.

131. RFP page 115, M.5.1.4. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project with Multiple Locations: If a contract is for "remote services", to be conducted at locations not specified in the contract, and those services are performed by W-2 staff and 1099 consultants in multiple off-site locations, would this meet the requirement for points under M.5.1.4? If so, what evidence is necessary to support the credit for multiple locations? Would 1099 agreements specifying subcontractor locations be sufficient?

Response: If locations are not identified in the contract, then we need evidence that the contract states that multiple places of performance would be required. Then, we would need evidence like a monthly status report or some other form of contract documentation that specifically identifies the contract number, place of performance, etc. Subcontractor locations are not considered multiple locations.

132. Has the November 10th Industry Day webinar been posted on FBO or the OASIS site? Could you please provide a link?

Response: The presentation as well as the Q&A from the webinar have been posted in FBO.GOV. The actual recording of the webinar itself experienced a technical failure. See MOD 4 Amendment in FBO.GOV.

133. One item that we wanted to verify is that we have a DCAA accounting system (that has been audited by our CFA) and it has all of the components for FPRA/FPRR/ABR, EVMS and Acceptable Estimating System that we use. Can you please let us know if this is acceptable?

Response: Unless a Federal Government entity such as DCAA or DCMA or some other cognizant federal audit agency has specifically declared in writing that your Accounting System, Purchasing System, EVMS, Estimating System or any Forward Price Rate Agreement, Approved Billing Rates or Forward Pricing Rate Agreements have been officially approved, then you may NOT take credit for them in the scoring matrix. Internal or Independent analysis of systems is irrelevant. Either the Federal Government has approved these systems or they have not. If the Government has approved the system, claim the points associated. If the Government has not approved the system, do NOT claim the points.

134. Can you confirm that the Facility Clearance letter should be submitted as part of Volume 5 and titled ABC.VOL5.FCL.pdf

Response: You do not have to submit the letter. We validate facility clearance status directly in the FCL database. If there is a discrepancy, we will reach out to clarify.

135. Will you allow new Joint Ventures to be formed?

Response: Absolutely not. First, this is an on-ramp, not a new solicitation. On-ramps are a re-opening of the original solicitation. Accordingly, the terms and conditions of the original solicitation remain in place. Otherwise, you would have contract awards for the same contract environment based upon differing criteria, evaluation parameters, and rules which is unfair to all involved. Secondly, we are seeking proven performers, not the hope of successful performance by companies who have never worked together before.